



# RFQ CNB-PR-2026-06-17 Design-Build Services for the Battlefords Regional Twin Pad Arena & Events Centre

RFQ # CNB-PR-2026-06-17

CITY OF NORTH BATTLEFORD

SUMMARY OF KEY INFORMATION

<b>RFQ Title</b>	<b>Design-Build Services for the Battlefords Regional Twin Pad Arena &amp; Events Centre</b> <b>RFQ # CNB-PR-2026-06-17</b>
	Proponent must use this title on all correspondence.
<b>Contact Person</b>	The point of contact for this RFQ is:  <b>City Clerk's Department / City Procurement Contact</b> <b>City of North Battleford, SK, Canada</b> <b>E-mail: tenders@cityofnb.ca</b> <b>Phone: 306-445-1700</b>
	Nustadia Recreation Inc. is acting as Design-Build Facilitator / Owner's Representative to the City.
<b>Enquiries</b>	Please direct all enquiries by email to the contact person through the City procurement process. Enquiries received by any other means may not be answered.
<b>Deadline for Questions</b>	Questions must be submitted no later than <b>2:00 p.m., Saskatchewan Time, June 26, 2026</b> , unless otherwise amended by addendum.
<b>Submission Deadline</b>	<b>Submission Time is 2:00 p.m., Saskatchewan Time, July 8, 2026</b> , or as indicated in the call for bids, unless otherwise amended by addendum.
<b>Submission Location</b>	Statements of Qualifications are to be submitted through the City's designated online bid platform:  <a href="https://www.cityofnb.ca/our-city-government/tenders-and-bids/">https://www.cityofnb.ca/our-city-government/tenders-and-bids/</a>  <a href="https://www.sasktenders.ca/">https://www.sasktenders.ca/</a>  Submissions by email to Nustadia Recreation Inc. will not be accepted unless expressly authorized by addendum.

This Request for Qualifications is issued by the Corporation of the City of North Battleford for the purpose of identifying and shortlisting qualified Design-Build teams capable of delivering the Battlefords Regional Twin Pad Arena & Events Centre. The Proponent must use the RFQ title, "Design-Build Services for the Battlefords Regional Twin Pad Arena & Events Centre," and the RFQ number CNB-PR-2026-06-17 on all correspondence, submissions, addenda acknowledgements, and related materials.

The point of contact for this RFQ is the City Clerk's Department / City Procurement Contact, City of North Battleford, 1291 - 101st Street, PO Box 460, North Battleford, Saskatchewan, S9A 2Y6. All enquiries must be directed through the City procurement process by email to [tenders@cityofnb.ca](mailto:tenders@cityofnb.ca), with the RFQ number and project title clearly identified in the subject line. Nustadia Recreation Inc. is acting as Design-Build Facilitator / Owner's Representative to the City, but is not the official submission recipient and has no authority to amend this RFQ except through addenda issued by the City. Enquiries received by any other means may not be answered, and any information provided outside the formal enquiry and addendum process will not be binding on the City.

Statements of Qualifications must be received no later than July 8, 2026 at 2:00 p.m., Saskatchewan Time, unless otherwise amended by addendum. Submissions are to be submitted through the City's designated online bid platform at <https://www.cityofnb.ca/our-city-government/tenders-and-bids/>, or by such other submission method as may be expressly identified by the City through addendum. The Proponent is solely responsible for ensuring that a complete submission, including all required forms, schedules, attachments, acknowledgements, and supporting information, is received before the submission deadline.

This RFQ is the first stage of a two-stage Design-Build procurement process. Through this RFQ, the City intends to identify a shortlist of approximately three to four qualified Design-Build teams. Shortlisted teams will be invited to participate in a subsequent Request for Proposals process. The RFP stage will require more detailed technical submissions, preliminary design and site concepts, pricing, commercial information, and a final evaluation process leading to selection of a preferred Design-Build partner.

The anticipated timing for issuance of the subsequent RFP is preliminary and subject to change. The City reserves the right to delay, modify, suspend, or cancel the RFP release schedule based on funding approvals, Council direction, project readiness, internal approvals, or any other consideration the City determines relevant. Shortlisting through this RFQ does not guarantee that the RFP will be issued on the dates identified in this RFQ, or that the project will proceed to construction.

The City's intent is not to select a Design-Build team on lowest cost at this RFQ stage. This RFQ is intended to assess qualifications, experience, capacity, project understanding, team structure, collaborative approach, and suitability for a complex civic recreation and events facility. Pricing, detailed design concepts, and final commercial terms will be addressed in the subsequent RFP and negotiation stages.

## Table of Contents

SECTION 1 — SUMMARY OF THE OPPORTUNITY .....	6
1.1 Summary.....	6
1.2 Invitation .....	6
1.3 Project Background.....	6
1.4 Project Vision.....	7
1.5 Current Project Status.....	8
1.6 Class C Estimate and Cost Framework .....	8
1.7 Procurement Intent and Budget Alignment.....	9
1.8 Anticipated Contracting Approach.....	9
SECTION 2 — STANDARD TERMS AND CONDITIONS.....	10
2.1 Definitions.....	10
2.2 Acceptance of Terms and Conditions.....	10
2.3 Submission and Deadline.....	11
2.4 Completeness of Statement of Qualifications .....	11
2.5 Withdrawal of Statement of Qualifications .....	11
2.6 Proponent’s Expenses .....	11
2.7 Confidentiality .....	12
2.8 Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.....	12
2.9 Conflict of Interest .....	12
2.10 No Lobbying.....	13
2.11 Non-Collusion .....	13
2.12 City’s Right to Accept, Reject, Cancel, or Modify .....	13
2.13 Liability for Errors .....	13
2.14 Addenda.....	13
2.15 Validity of Statements of Qualifications.....	14
2.16 Subcontractors and Team Members.....	14
2.17 Legal Entities .....	14
2.18 Intellectual Property.....	14
2.19 Business License, Legislative Compliance, and Permits .....	14
2.20 Insurance, Bonding, and Security.....	14
2.21 Health, Safety, and WCB .....	15
SECTION 3 — INSTRUCTIONS TO PROPONENTS .....	15
3.1 Submission Requirements .....	15
3.2 Enquiries and Communication .....	15
3.3 Anticipated RFQ Schedule.....	16
3.4 No Site Meeting at RFQ Stage .....	16

3.5 Mandatory Requirements .....	16
3.6 No Design or Price Submission Required at RFQ Stage .....	17
SECTION 4 — STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS FORMAT .....	17
4.1 Title Page and Letter of Introduction.....	17
4.2 Executive Summary .....	17
4.3 Project Understanding.....	18
4.4 Proponent Team and Organization .....	18
4.5 Relevant Project Experience .....	19
4.6 Key Personnel .....	19
4.7 Design-Build Approach .....	19
4.8 Cost, Schedule, and Risk Management.....	20
4.9 Safety, Quality, Commissioning, and Warranty .....	21
4.10 Financial Capacity, Bonding, and Insurance .....	21
4.11 Regional, Community, and Indigenous Considerations .....	21
4.12 Compliance and Exceptions .....	22
SECTION 5 — EVALUATION PROCESS.....	22
5.1 Evaluation Overview.....	22
5.2 Stage 1 — Mandatory Requirements (Pass/Fail).....	22
5.2.1 Submission Compliance.....	22
5.2.2 Design-Build Team Structure.....	23
5.2.3 Financial Capacity, Bonding, and Insurance Requirements .....	23
5.2.4 Construction Experience .....	23
5.2.5 Design Experience .....	23
5.2.6 Comparable Project Experience .....	24
5.2.7 Safety Requirements .....	24
5.2.8 Litigation and Claims Disclosure .....	24
5.2.9 Conflict of Interest Declaration .....	24
5.2.10 Schedule and Mobilization Capacity.....	24
5.2.11 Climate Resilience Experience .....	24
5.2.12 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment and Energy Performance Experience .....	25
5.3 Stage 2 — Rated Written Submission Evaluation .....	25
5.4 Written Submission Evaluation Criteria (100 Points) .....	25
5.5 Design-Build Team Continuity and Prior Collaboration Scoring Guidance .....	26
5.6 Scoring Scale.....	27
5.7 Minimum Technical Requirements.....	28
5.8 Final Scoring Summary .....	28
5.9 Shortlisting .....	29
SECTION 6 — NEXT STAGE RFP PROCESS.....	29

6.1 RFP to Shortlisted Proponents .....	29
6.2 RFP Evaluation and Preferred Proponent Selection .....	29
6.3 Contract Negotiation and Pre-Construction Confirmation .....	30
6.4 Design-Build Delivery and Construction.....	30
APPENDIX A — PRELIMINARY SCOPE OF DESIGN-BUILD SERVICES AND DELIVERABLES.....	31
APPENDIX B — STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS SUBMISSION FORM.....	33
APPENDIX C — DRAFT DECLARATION OF DISCLOSURE .....	35
APPENDIX D — INSURANCE, BONDING, WCB, SAFETY, AND COMPLIANCE.....	36
APPENDIX D-1 — INSURANCE AND BONDING CAPACITY FORM .....	36
APPENDIX D-2 — WCB AND HEALTH & SAFETY COMPLIANCE FORM.....	38

## SECTION 1 — SUMMARY OF THE OPPORTUNITY

### 1.1 Summary

This Request for Qualifications is issued by the Corporation of the City of North Battleford for the purpose of seeking Statements of Qualifications from experienced and qualified Design-Build teams for the Battlefords Regional Twin Pad Arena and Events Centre. The City is seeking teams with demonstrated experience in the planning, pre-construction confirmation, design, construction, commissioning, and delivery of large-scale recreation, arena, spectator, and event facilities. The City's objective is to select a Design-Build partner that is capable of working collaboratively with the City, its project advisors, funders, stakeholders, user groups, and community partners to advance the project from current planning and costing work into detailed design, construction, commissioning, and opening.

The information provided in this RFQ is intended to give Proponents a general overview of the project, the procurement process, and the qualifications required. It is not intended to be exhaustive and does not relieve Proponents from making their own assessment of the work, the project context, the City's requirements, and the risks associated with participation in the procurement process. This RFQ is a prequalification document only and does not create an obligation on the City to proceed to an RFP, to award a contract, or to compensate any Proponent for the cost of preparing a Statement of Qualifications.

### 1.2 Invitation

The City invites qualified Design-Build teams to submit Statements of Qualifications for the Design-Build Services required for the Battlefords Regional Twin Pad Arena and Events Centre. Proponents are expected to assemble complete teams that include, at minimum, a Design-Builder or construction lead, an architectural prime consultant, structural, mechanical, electrical, civil, planning, landscape architecture, traffic / transportation, refrigeration, code, accessibility, cost, scheduling, commissioning, and other specialty consultants as required for a major twin pad arena and events facility. Geotechnical, environmental, surveying, food service, audio-visual, security, technology, signage, and other required subconsultants shall be the responsibility of the Design-Build team where required. Teams should demonstrate that they have the legal, technical, financial, managerial, and operational capacity to deliver a project of this complexity in Saskatchewan.

The City intends to shortlist the most qualified Proponents and invite only those shortlisted Proponents to participate in the RFP stage. The RFP stage is expected to include a more detailed Owner's Statement of Requirements to be issued as part of the RFP, facility program information, site and servicing information, design and performance requirements, procurement rules, evaluation criteria, draft contract documentation, and requirements for technical and commercial submissions.

### 1.3 Project Background

The Battlefords Regional Twin Pad Arena and Events Centre has emerged from several years of facility condition review, recreation planning, community engagement, feasibility analysis, regional governance discussions, fundraising work, and preliminary design development. The City of North

Battleford and surrounding region have long depended on arena infrastructure that supports hockey, figure skating, tournaments, public skating, rodeos, powwows, cultural events, concerts, trade shows, community gatherings, and other recreation and event uses. The feasibility work identified that the existing Access Communications Centre and Don Ross Arena are aging, constrained by capacity and functionality limitations, and not fully aligned with contemporary expectations for accessibility, user experience, dressing rooms, energy efficiency, event hosting, and year-round multi-use programming.

The project is located within a regional context. North Battleford and the Town of Battleford are known collectively as the Battlefords and serve as a hub for northwest Saskatchewan. The Battlefords are part of Treaty 6 Territory and the homeland of the Métis, with strong ties to surrounding municipalities and First Nations communities. The region's recreation infrastructure serves users who cross municipal and jurisdictional boundaries for sport, culture, recreation, tourism, and community events. Although the current project direction is City-owned, the facility is intended to remain regional in purpose and benefit.

The Regional Governance Framework exercise explored whether a formal shared ownership structure could be established among municipal, rural, and Indigenous partners. That process did not ultimately result in a shared ownership model, but it strengthened regional understanding, clarified partnership conditions, and confirmed that the City must move forward with ownership clarity to address long-term arena replacement needs. The City-owned model provides clearer ownership, accountability, and procurement authority while preserving the facility's broader regional purpose.

## 1.4 Project Vision

The vision for the Battlefords Regional Twin Pad Arena and Events Centre is to create a modern, inclusive, accessible, sustainable, and event-capable civic facility that serves as a regional destination for sports, recreation, community activity, cultural gatherings, and economic development. The facility is expected to support local athletes, youth sport, adult recreation, public skating, tournaments, figure skating, junior hockey, minor hockey, dry-floor events, community meetings, trade shows, concerts, rodeos, powwows, and other gatherings that contribute to the social, cultural, and economic life of the Battlefords region.

The facility is expected to include two full-sized ice surfaces, spectator seating, team and player support spaces, officials' rooms, accessible and inclusive change areas, first aid and trainer spaces, dryland or fitness training areas, public concourse space, washrooms, concessions, ticketing, storage, loading, mechanical and refrigeration spaces, community and multi-purpose rooms, administrative areas, retail space, event support areas, and the site infrastructure needed to support a civic-scale public assembly building. The facility should be designed to support year-round operation of the ice surfaces, whether or not the City ultimately elects to operate ice on a year-round basis. The final facility program, performance standards, site requirements, operating assumptions, and budget parameters will be further defined in the Owner's Statement of Requirements to be issued as part of the RFP.

The City expects the successful Design-Build team to understand that this project is not simply a rink replacement. It is a civic recreation and events facility with significant structural, mechanical,

electrical, refrigeration, accessibility, operations, spectator, event, and site requirements. The selected team must be able to deliver a facility that balances long-term functionality, cost control, constructability, operational efficiency, user experience, event flexibility, energy performance, and community identity.

## 1.5 Current Project Status

The project has completed feasibility, preliminary concept, regional governance, fundraising readiness, and early design development work. The earlier Arena Feasibility Study identified the Regional Twin Pad Arena as the preferred long-term facility solution for the Battlefords region, subject to funding, governance, affordability, procurement, and implementation considerations. Since that time, the project has advanced from a feasibility-level Class D estimate to a more developed Class C construction cost estimate prepared by Hanscomb and dated May 21, 2026. The Class C Estimate now forms the current construction cost reference for this RFQ.

The Class C Estimate identifies the proposed project as a new, two-storey regional twin pad arena with a total gross floor area of 121,816 square feet, consisting of a 96,485 square foot main level and a 25,331 square foot concourse level. The detailed construction assumptions, quantities, systems, and line-item estimate information will be addressed through the RFP process and may be made available as a reference document or addendum. Proponents should not assume that any construction method, structural system, envelope system, or material described in background documents is prescribed by this RFQ unless expressly stated in the RFP or contract documents.

The current Class C construction cost benchmark is \$74,506,700, exclusive of the separately identified 5.0% construction allowance. With the separate 5.0% construction allowance of \$3,725,300, the estimate presents a total construction estimate including allowances of \$78,232,000. The Class C Estimate is a construction cost benchmark only and does not represent the full total project budget.

The Class C Estimate will be subject to further review, refinement, and confirmation through the RFP and Design-Build process. The City expects the Design-Build procurement process to include disciplined cost confirmation, market sounding, scope review, risk review, and value management before the project proceeds to final pricing, contract award, or construction authorization.

## 1.6 Class C Estimate and Cost Framework

The City's current cost reference for the project is the Hanscomb Class C Estimate, Battlefords Regional Twin Pad Arena, New Construction, North Battleford, Saskatchewan, dated May 21, 2026. The estimate is provided as a current construction cost benchmark for the project and is intended to inform the RFQ, the subsequent RFP, the Owner's Statement of Requirements, and the Design-Build process. The estimate is not a guarantee of the construction cost, not a prediction of the lowest possible bid, and not a complete total project budget.

The Class C Estimate was prepared from documentation received from Kirk Banadyga Architect Inc., (KBA) including the KBA Class C Basis of Design V03, dated April 2026 and received April 27, 2026, together with representative main level, concourse level, building section, and rendering drawings originally dated January 24, 2025 and received April 27, 2026. The estimate was also supplemented by information gathered from the design team. Any design changes or additions

made after the issuance of the documentation identified in the estimate were not incorporated into the report.

The Design-Build team selected through the subsequent RFP procurement process will be required to review the Class C Estimate in detail, including line-item descriptions, unit prices, assumptions, inclusions, exclusions, contingencies, escalation, markups, and market assumptions. The Design-Build team will be required to reconcile the Class C Estimate against the Owner's Statement of Requirements, the final site, the proposed design approach, the delivery model, the construction schedule, subcontractor market conditions, and the City's funding and approval framework.

Because the Class C Estimate is a construction cost estimate, the RFQ and subsequent RFP must distinguish between construction cost and total project cost. The City acknowledges that additional soft costs, owner's costs, financing, permits, taxes, FF&E, commissioning, contingencies, and other project costs will form part of the overall project budget outside the Class C construction estimate. The Design-Build team may be required through the RFP and contract process to identify construction-related assumptions, exclusions, and impacts that affect the City's total project budget.

## 1.7 Procurement Intent and Budget Alignment

The City intends to use a two-stage Design-Build procurement model. The Class C Estimate will be used as a current cost reference, but the City expects the Design-Build procurement to test and confirm the estimate before the project advances into final contract award and construction. The City recognizes that the Class C Estimate is based on defined assumptions, including competitive bids being received in North Battleford in May 2026 from general contractors and major subcontractors and suppliers under a stipulated sum form of contract. If those assumptions are not met, pricing may exceed the estimate.

This is particularly important because the City is pursuing a Design-Build process and will require shortlisted Proponents to demonstrate how they will confirm the Class C Estimate within that environment, including through design-to-budget discipline, market testing, trade engagement, constructability review, schedule review, escalation review, risk analysis, and reconciliation of the Design-Build approach with the cost assumptions contained in the Hanscomb estimate.

During the RFP, negotiation, and pre-construction confirmation period, the preferred Design-Build team will be expected to assist the City and partners in confirming whether the project scope, facility program, site requirements, construction budget, total project budget, schedule, risk profile, and funding assumptions are aligned. The City may use the results of this work to proceed to construction, adjust scope, refine the budget, seek additional approvals, defer the project, or terminate the process.

## 1.8 Anticipated Contracting Approach

The final contract form has not yet been confirmed and may be refined before the RFP stage. The City anticipates using a Design-Build form of contract appropriate for the selected delivery model and may use, adapt, or supplement standard Canadian Construction Documents Committee forms, including CCDC 14 or another form acceptable to the City. The RFP stage will include additional detail regarding contract terms, insurance, bonding, warranties, indemnities, payment,

schedule, performance security, design responsibility, dispute resolution, intellectual property, and transition from award to design and construction.

No contract for Design-Build services will arise from this RFQ. A Proponent's inclusion on the shortlist does not guarantee participation in all future stages, does not guarantee award, and does not create any entitlement to compensation unless expressly stated in a future procurement document or agreement.

## SECTION 2 — STANDARD TERMS AND CONDITIONS

### 2.1 Definitions

In this RFQ,

“Addenda” means all additional information, clarifications, amendments, revisions, or supplementary instructions issued by the City in relation to this RFQ.

“City” means the Corporation of the City of North Battleford.

“Closing Time” or “Submission Time” means the date and time by which Statements of Qualifications must be received by the City.

“Contract” means any written agreement resulting from a subsequent procurement process, if any, executed by the City and a successful Proponent.

“Design-Builder” means the entity or team that may ultimately enter into a contract with the City to provide design, construction, commissioning, warranty, and related services.

“Design-Build Facilitator” or “Owner’s Representative” means Nustadia Recreation Inc., acting as an advisor and facilitator to the City for the Design-Build procurement process. The Design-Build Facilitator is not the Owner, is not the official submission recipient, and has no authority to amend this RFQ except through addenda issued by the City.

“Must,” “shall,” or “mandatory” means a requirement that must be met for a submission to receive consideration.

“Proponent” means a person, corporation, joint venture, partnership, consortium, or legal entity with the capacity to contract that submits a Statement of Qualifications in response to this RFQ.

“RFQ” means this Request for Qualifications, including all appendices, schedules, forms, referenced documents, and addenda.

“RFP” means a subsequent Request for Proposals that may be issued to shortlisted Proponents.

“Statement of Qualifications” or “SOQ” means the written response submitted by a Proponent in response to this RFQ.

### 2.2 Acceptance of Terms and Conditions

By submitting a Statement of Qualifications, the Proponent accepts all terms and conditions set out in this RFQ, including all appendices and any addenda issued by the City. The SOQ must be signed by a person authorized to bind the Proponent. If the Proponent is a joint venture,

consortium, or team of multiple legal entities, the SOQ must clearly identify the lead entity and must include evidence satisfactory to the City that the lead entity is authorized to act on behalf of the Proponent team for the purposes of this RFQ.

Submission of an SOQ confirms that the Proponent has read, understands, and accepts the RFQ requirements, has reviewed the available information, has made its own assessment of the nature of the project, and has submitted all information it wishes the City to consider at the RFQ stage.

## 2.3 Submission and Deadline

Statements of Qualifications must be received by the City before the Closing Time through the City's designated online bid platform at [insert City bid platform website], unless another submission method is expressly authorized by addendum. The Proponent is solely responsible for ensuring that the complete submission, including all attachments, forms, schedules, declarations, and addenda acknowledgements, is uploaded and received by the City before the Closing Time. Late submissions will be rejected and will not be opened or evaluated.

Submissions delivered by email, courier, hand delivery, direct transmission to Nustadia Recreation Inc., or any method other than the designated procurement platform will not be accepted unless expressly authorized by addendum. The Proponent is solely responsible for complying with the City's procurement platform requirements, including any upload limits, file naming requirements, file format requirements, and confirmation receipt process.

The City makes no guarantee that electronic transmission or upload through the procurement platform will be uninterrupted, timely, or error-free. The Proponent bears all risk associated with delivering its SOQ through the required submission method and is strongly encouraged to submit well in advance of the Closing Time.

## 2.4 Completeness of Statement of Qualifications

By submitting an SOQ, the Proponent warrants that the submission identifies the complete team, qualifications, experience, and information required for the City to evaluate the Proponent at the RFQ stage. The Proponent must not assume that the City will seek clarification, fill gaps, conduct independent investigations, or rely on information not included in the SOQ. The City may, but is not obligated to, seek clarification from any Proponent.

## 2.5 Withdrawal of Statement of Qualifications

A Proponent may withdraw a submitted SOQ at any time before the Closing Time by written notice signed by an authorized representative of the Proponent and delivered to the RFQ contact person. Withdrawal requests received after the Closing Time will not be accepted unless the City, in its sole discretion, determines otherwise.

## 2.6 Proponent's Expenses

Proponents are solely responsible for all costs and expenses incurred in preparing and submitting an SOQ, attending any meetings, responding to clarification requests, or otherwise participating in this RFQ process. The City will not be liable to any Proponent for any costs, expenses, damages,

losses, or loss of anticipated profit arising from participation in this RFQ, cancellation of this RFQ, non-shortlisting, failure to proceed to an RFP, or any subsequent procurement decision.

## 2.7 Confidentiality

Confidentiality of records and information relating to this project must be maintained at all times. All correspondence, documentation, drawings, reports, data, or information provided by or on behalf of the City to any Proponent in connection with this RFQ remains the property of the City, must be treated as confidential, and must not be used for any purpose other than preparing an SOQ and participating in any related subsequent procurement process.

The City may require Proponents to enter into a confidentiality agreement before receiving certain background information, technical documents, site information, cost information, or other materials. Failure to execute a required confidentiality agreement may result in the Proponent being denied access to certain documents or being disqualified from further participation.

## 2.8 Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act

The Proponent acknowledges that any SOQ submitted to the City becomes a record in the custody or control of the City and may be subject to the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. Information submitted by Proponents, including technical information, team information, financial capacity information, schedules, methodologies, drawings, plans, and other materials, may be requested under applicable access to information legislation.

If a Proponent believes that any portion of its SOQ contains confidential, proprietary, commercial, financial, or technical information that should not be disclosed, the Proponent must clearly identify those portions and provide the basis for confidentiality. Marking information as confidential does not guarantee that it will be withheld from disclosure, but it will assist the City in responding to any request. At minimum, the City may publicly identify the names of Proponents, shortlisted Proponents, evaluation outcomes, recommendations to Council, and other information required for transparency, reporting, approval, or procurement accountability.

## 2.9 Conflict of Interest

In its SOQ, the Proponent must disclose any actual, potential, or perceived conflict of interest that could compromise, or appear to compromise, the Proponent's participation in this RFQ, its ability to perform future work, or the fairness of the procurement process. The Proponent must also disclose whether it is aware of any City employee, Council member, advisor, board member, committee member, or representative having a financial or personal interest in the Proponent or any member of the Proponent team.

If a conflict of interest exists, arises, or is discovered during the RFQ process, the City may, in its sole discretion, disqualify the Proponent, require mitigation measures, restrict the participation of certain team members, or take any other action the City considers appropriate. Proponents are responsible for monitoring conflicts throughout the RFQ and any subsequent RFP process.

## 2.10 No Lobbying

A Proponent must not attempt to influence the outcome of this RFQ process through lobbying or improper communications. From the issue date of this RFQ until the conclusion of the RFQ process, Proponents must not communicate directly or indirectly about this RFQ with any member of City Council, City staff, evaluation committee members, advisors, consultants, user group representatives, media representatives, or any other person involved in the project except through the designated RFQ contact person and the formal process established by the City.

Any attempt to influence the RFQ process, obtain unfair advantage, seek information outside the formal process, or communicate in a manner contrary to this RFQ may result in disqualification.

## 2.11 Non-Collusion

Each Proponent must confirm that its participation in this RFQ is conducted without collusion, fraud, bid-rigging, or improper coordination with any other Proponent. If the City determines that a Proponent has engaged in collusion or fraudulent conduct, the City may disqualify the Proponent, terminate any subsequent agreement, or pursue any other remedy available at law.

## 2.12 City's Right to Accept, Reject, Cancel, or Modify

The City reserves the right, in its sole and absolute discretion, to accept or reject any or all SOQs, to shortlist any number of Proponents, to not shortlist any Proponent, to cancel this RFQ, to reissue this RFQ, to amend the process, to seek clarification, to waive irregularities, to negotiate with any one or more Proponents in a subsequent stage, or to proceed in any other manner the City considers appropriate.

The highest scoring Proponent or any Proponent will not necessarily be shortlisted. The City may consider any criteria it deems relevant, including qualifications, experience, reputation, claims history, financial capacity, team strength, technical capacity, past performance, safety record, ability to provide continuous availability of key personnel, project understanding, schedule and budget approach, and suitability for a Design-Build process.

## 2.13 Liability for Errors

While the City has used reasonable efforts to provide accurate information in this RFQ, the information contained in or referenced by this RFQ is supplied only as a guideline for Proponents. The information is not guaranteed or warranted to be accurate, complete, current, or exhaustive. Nothing in this RFQ relieves Proponents from forming their own opinions and conclusions with respect to the project, the site, the procurement process, the scope of services, or the risks associated with the work.

## 2.14 Addenda

The City may issue addenda to clarify, modify, or supplement this RFQ. Addenda may be posted electronically through the City's designated procurement platform, issued through the City website, sent by email, or otherwise distributed by the City. It is the Proponent's responsibility to verify whether any addenda have been issued. Proponents must acknowledge receipt of all addenda in

their SOQ. The City may extend the Closing Time if it determines that additional time is required for Proponents to respond to an addendum.

## 2.15 Validity of Statements of Qualifications

Unless otherwise stated, SOQs must remain valid and open for acceptance by the City for a period of at least ninety calendar days after the Closing Time. During that period, Proponents must maintain the availability of proposed key personnel, team members, and organizational commitments unless changes are approved by the City.

## 2.16 Subcontractors and Team Members

The Proponent must identify all major team members, subcontractors, consultants, and subconsultants proposed for the project. The Proponent must identify the lead entity that will be responsible for the team and, if shortlisted and ultimately selected through a subsequent RFP, capable of entering into a contract with the City. The City will evaluate the experience and qualifications of the Proponent's team, including major subcontractors and consultants.

The Proponent may not change key team members after submission without the City's prior written consent. The City may withhold consent if it determines that a proposed change would materially affect the Proponent's qualifications, evaluation score, or suitability for the project.

## 2.17 Legal Entities

The City reserves the right to require confirmation of the Proponent's legal status, corporate authority, joint venture arrangements, bonding capacity, insurance capacity, and authority to enter into future agreements. The City may disqualify a Proponent if it is not satisfied that the Proponent is clearly identified, legally capable of contracting, or the same entity that submitted the SOQ.

## 2.18 Intellectual Property

All SOQ materials submitted to the City may be used by the City for evaluation, reporting, approval, audit, and procurement purposes. Unless otherwise agreed in writing, the City will not acquire ownership of proprietary materials contained in an SOQ merely by receiving the SOQ. However, the City may retain copies of all submissions as procurement records. Any intellectual property rights associated with future project deliverables will be addressed in the RFP and contract documents.

## 2.19 Business License, Legislative Compliance, and Permits

The successful Proponent, if any, will be required to comply with all applicable federal, provincial, municipal, and regulatory requirements, including Saskatchewan licensing requirements, building codes, accessibility requirements, occupational health and safety requirements, environmental requirements, labour requirements, and City business licensing requirements. Any Design-Build contract will require the Design-Builder to obtain or assist with obtaining applicable permits, approvals, inspections, and authority having jurisdiction sign-offs, as defined in the final contract.

## 2.20 Insurance, Bonding, and Security

Proponents must demonstrate that they have the capacity to obtain insurance, bonding, and performance security appropriate for a major Design-Build project. Minimum insurance

requirements for the RFQ stage may include confirmation of commercial general liability, automobile liability, professional liability, wrap-up liability, builder's risk, contractor's pollution liability, and any other coverage required by the City. The City's standard RFP template identifies commercial general liability, professional liability, automobile liability where applicable, primary coverage, and certificates of insurance as core requirements, and those requirements will be refined for this project.

At the RFP stage, shortlisted Proponents may be required to provide letters from acceptable sureties confirming bonding capacity, including bid bond, consent of surety, performance bond, labour and material payment bond, or other security requirements. The final bonding and insurance requirements will be set out in the RFP and contract documents.

## 2.21 Health, Safety, and WCB

The successful Proponent will be required to comply with all applicable occupational health and safety legislation and City safety requirements. Proponents must demonstrate a strong safety record, a mature health and safety management system, and the ability to manage safety for a large public construction project. Proponents must provide evidence of WCB status, clearance, or equivalent documentation as required by Saskatchewan legislation and City policy. The City may require safety documentation, audits, incident records, COR or SECOR status, or similar information at the RFQ or RFP stage.

## SECTION 3 — INSTRUCTIONS TO PROPONENTS

### 3.1 Submission Requirements

The SOQ must include a signed submission form, a declaration of disclosure and conflict of interest form, acknowledgement of all addenda, and the Proponent's qualification materials. The SOQ should be written clearly and should provide sufficient information for the City to evaluate the Proponent's qualifications without relying on assumptions or external research.

The SOQ should be limited to forty [40] pages, excluding signed forms, insurance and bonding letters, resumes, project sheets, financial capacity letters, safety certificates, addenda acknowledgements, and appendices. Resumes should be concise and should identify each key person's role, relevant experience, professional registrations, and availability.

The SOQ must be submitted through the City's designated online bid platform at [insert City bid platform website] by the Closing Time. The submission title should read: "RFQ CNB-PR-2026-06-17 - Battlefords Regional Twin Pad Arena and Events Centre - Design-Build Services - [Proponent Name]."

### 3.2 Enquiries and Communication

All enquiries must be submitted in writing to the City Clerk's Department / City Procurement Contact at [tenders@cityofnb.ca](mailto:tenders@cityofnb.ca). Enquiries must be received no later than June 26, 2026 at 2:00 p.m., Saskatchewan Time. The City may respond by addendum if the response is material to the RFQ. Oral responses, informal comments, or information received from any source other than a formal addendum are not binding on the City.

Proponents must identify one senior individual who will act as the Proponent’s primary contact for this RFQ. That individual must have authority to receive communications, submit clarifications, and coordinate the Proponent’s response.

### 3.3 Anticipated RFQ Schedule

The following schedule is provided for planning purposes only and may be changed by the City by addendum or written notice. In particular, the timing for issuance of the subsequent RFP, RFP evaluation, contract negotiation, and construction mobilization is subject to funding approvals, Council direction, project readiness, internal approvals, and the City’s decision to proceed.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>
June 17, 2026	RFQ issued
June 26, 2026	Deadline for written questions
July 1, 2026	Final addendum issued
July 8, 2026	SOQs close at 2:00 p.m., Saskatchewan Time
July 14 - 20, 2026	RFQ evaluation period
July 24, 2026	Shortlist approval / notification
July 27, 2026	RFP issued to shortlisted Proponents
July 27 – October 5, 2026	RFP open period
October 6 – October 16, 2026	RFP evaluation and preferred Proponent selection
October - November / December 2026	Contract negotiation period of up to eight weeks
April 1, 2027	Tentative construction mobilization / start date

### 3.4 No Site Meeting at RFQ Stage

Unless otherwise stated by addendum, no mandatory site meeting will be held during the RFQ stage. The City may provide available site, planning, design, or background information for general context. A site visit, information session, or commercially confidential meetings may be included in the subsequent RFP stage for shortlisted Proponents.

### 3.5 Mandatory Requirements

Mandatory requirements will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis as Stage 1 of the evaluation process. A Proponent must receive a PASS on all mandatory requirements to proceed to the rated evaluation stage. Failure to satisfy any mandatory requirement will result in disqualification from further consideration, subject only to the City's reserved rights to seek clarification of submitted information where clarification does not alter the substance of the submission.

At minimum, each Proponent must demonstrate submission compliance, a complete Design-Build team structure, sufficient financial capacity, bonding and insurance capacity for a project with an estimated construction value exceeding \$75 million, relevant construction experience, relevant design experience, comparable Design-Build or public-use facility experience, safety compliance, litigation and claims disclosure, conflict of interest disclosure, and schedule and mobilization capacity to support a tentative construction start date of April 1, 2027. The detailed mandatory requirements are set out in Section 5.2.

The Proponent must also demonstrate capacity to work within an approved budget, manage cost escalation and constructability risk, provide integrated design and construction services, meet schedule requirements, maintain safety performance, obtain required insurance and bonding, and support the City through design, construction, commissioning, handover, and warranty.

### 3.6 No Design or Price Submission Required at RFQ Stage

The City does not require detailed design concepts, renderings, construction pricing, or a final fee proposal at the RFQ stage. Proponents should focus on qualifications, experience, team structure, delivery approach, capacity, and understanding of the project. The City may reject or disregard unsolicited pricing or design submissions if they are inconsistent with the RFQ requirements or create evaluation concerns.

## SECTION 4 — STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS FORMAT

### 4.1 Title Page and Letter of Introduction

The SOQ must include a title page identifying:

- RFQ title,
- RFQ number,
- Proponent name,
- Lead entity,
- Address,
- Phone number,
- Email address, and
- Primary contact person.

The SOQ must include a one-page letter of introduction signed by a person authorized to bind the Proponent. The letter should confirm the Proponent's interest in the project, acceptance of the RFQ terms, acknowledgement of addenda, and commitment to participate in the subsequent RFP if shortlisted.

### 4.2 Executive Summary

The executive summary should provide a concise overview of the Proponent's team, qualifications, project understanding, and reasons the team is suited to deliver the Battlefords Regional Twin Pad Arena and Events Centre. The summary should identify:

- Design-Build lead,
- Architectural lead,
- Engineering leads,
- Major specialty consultants,
- Construction leadership, and
- Any key advisors.

It should also confirm the team’s understanding that the project is a City-owned facility with a regional purpose, a major public investment, and a complex recreation and events project requiring disciplined cost, schedule, risk, and stakeholder management.

### 4.3 Project Understanding

The Proponent should demonstrate a clear understanding that the project has advanced from a feasibility-level concept to a more defined project supported by a May 2026 Class C Estimate. The Proponent should show that it understands the current facility concept as a new two-storey regional twin pad arena of approximately 121,816 square feet, with a main level and concourse level, two ice surfaces, spectator and event functionality, public concourse areas, team and player support areas, officials' spaces, inclusive and accessible change areas, concessions, retail space, washrooms, storage, mechanical and electrical systems, refrigeration-related infrastructure, year-round ice operation capability, and typical site development.

The Proponent should also demonstrate that it understands the distinction between the Class C construction estimate and the City’s ultimate total project budget. The Proponent should not assume that the Hanscomb estimate includes all costs required to deliver a complete, operational, occupied, and fully commissioned public facility. Rather, the Proponent should identify how it will assist the City in confirming construction costs, identifying owner-carried costs, reviewing exclusions, clarifying allowances, establishing contingencies, and building a complete cost plan that can support Council, funding, and project approval decisions.

The Proponent should specifically address how it will help the City identify cost drivers, evaluate alternatives, preserve the core project objectives, and maintain alignment between scope and budget as design and pricing progress through the RFP, contract negotiation, and Design-Build delivery process.

### 4.4 Proponent Team and Organization

The SOQ must include an organizational chart showing the Proponent’s team structure, names and organizations of key team members, reporting relationships, and roles and responsibilities. The Proponent should identify the single point of responsibility for the Design-Build team:

- Proposed project executive,
- Project manager,
- Design manager,
- Construction manager,
- Superintendent,
- Architectural lead,
- Engineering leads,
- Arena/refrigeration specialist,
- Cost manager,
- Scheduler,
- Commissioning lead, and
- Quality manager.

The Proponent should describe how the team will integrate design, construction, costing, scheduling, procurement, operations input, and owner decision-making during a Design-Build process. The Proponent should also describe how it will manage subconsultants and subcontractors, maintain accountability, resolve interdisciplinary issues, and support timely decisions by the City.

## 4.5 Relevant Project Experience

The SOQ must include relevant project experience demonstrating the team's ability to deliver projects of similar scope, value, complexity, and public importance. Preference will be given to projects involving twin pad arenas, spectator arenas, recreation centres, public assembly buildings, civic facilities, event centres, aquatic or fieldhouse facilities, or other complex buildings involving significant mechanical, structural, electrical, refrigeration, public circulation, and operational requirements.

For each reference project, the Proponent should identify:

- Project name,
- Owner,
- Location,
- Delivery model,
- Contract value,
- Construction value,
- Gross floor area,
- Other important information to include major program components, completion date, role of the Proponent and key personnel, schedule performance, budget performance, claims or disputes if applicable, sustainability or accessibility features, and owner reference contact.

The Proponent should identify whether the same key personnel proposed for this project were involved in the reference project.

## 4.6 Key Personnel

The SOQ must include resumes for key personnel. Resumes should identify each person's proposed role, professional qualifications, registrations, years of experience, relevant project experience, role on comparable projects, and anticipated availability. The City will place significant weight on the qualifications and availability of the individuals who will actually deliver the project, not only the general experience of the firms.

The Proponent must not replace key personnel after submission without the City's prior written consent. If a key person becomes unavailable, the Proponent must propose a replacement with equal or better qualifications, and the City may approve, reject, or require additional information regarding the proposed replacement.

## 4.7 Design-Build Approach

The Proponent should describe its approach to Design-Build delivery, including:

- Design development and cost confirmation,
- Design-to-budget discipline,
- Constructability and value management,
- Constructability review,
- Risk management,
- Design management,
- Owner decision-making,
- Schedule development,
- Long-lead procurement,
- Permitting,
- Market sounding, and
- Transition from contract award to design completion, permitting, construction, commissioning, and turnover.

The Proponent should describe how it would work with the City to confirm the Owner's Statement of Requirements, confirm project scope, manage budget alignment, identify value opportunities, and develop cost certainty through the RFP, contract negotiation, and Design-Build delivery process.

The Proponent should explain how it manages collaboration while preserving accountability. The City is seeking a Design-Build partner capable of providing honest advice, identifying risks early, proposing practical solutions, and supporting informed decision-making. The City is not seeking a team that will simply advance design without regard to budget, constructability, lifecycle performance, or operating realities.

#### 4.8 Cost, Schedule, and Risk Management

The Proponent should describe its approach to confirming and managing the Class C Estimate during the Design-Build process. The City expects the selected Design-Build team to review the Hanscomb estimate in detail, identify areas of agreement or concern, reconcile quantities and assumptions, review unit rates, confirm market conditions, identify gaps between the estimate and the Owner's Statement of Requirements, and recommend any adjustments required to establish a reliable cost plan.

The Proponent should address the specific cost structure identified in the Class C Estimate, including the base new construction cost, site work allowance, transportation and accommodation allowance, general requirements, contractor fee, design and pricing allowance, escalation allowance, and construction allowance. The Proponent should also identify how it will manage the relationship between the Class C cost structure and the Design-Build team's own cost plan, procurement strategy, subcontractor engagement, contingency strategy, and eventual Guaranteed Maximum Price, stipulated sum, or other commercial structure acceptable to the City.

The Proponent should describe how it will address exclusions and owner-carried costs. The City expects Proponents to understand that items such as soft costs, professional fees, permits, development charges, owner's staff and management, financing, GST, loose furniture and furnishings, certain specialty audio-visual/security/ICAT items, third-party commissioning,

contaminated soil removal, winter construction premiums, phasing premiums, tariff premiums, cash allowances, and escalation beyond that identified in the estimate may affect total project affordability.

The Proponent should also address current construction market risks. The Class C Estimate notes that the construction market is relatively heated, that the volume of work may exceed available resources, that the construction workforce is aging, that qualified workers are difficult to find, that contractors are competing for the same tradespeople, and that global conflicts may affect commodity pricing and supply chains. The estimate recommends appropriate risk analysis and market sounding where these factors may affect the project. The City expects the Design-Build team to provide a clear methodology for monitoring and mitigating these risks.

#### 4.9 Safety, Quality, Commissioning, and Warranty

The Proponent should describe its safety program, safety performance, COR or equivalent status, WCB standing, site supervision model, subcontractor safety management, and incident reporting. The Proponent should also describe its quality management process, inspection and testing approach, commissioning strategy, deficiency management, record documentation, training, turnover, warranty service, and post-occupancy support.

The City expects that the selected Design-Build team will be responsible for delivering a safe, durable, code-compliant, maintainable, and operable facility. The Proponent should demonstrate that it understands the importance of commissioning major building systems, including refrigeration, HVAC, electrical, life safety, accessibility, building envelope, controls, ice plant operations, and event systems.

#### 4.10 Financial Capacity, Bonding, and Insurance

The SOQ must include evidence of financial capacity appropriate for a major public Design-Build project. This should include a letter from a surety licensed to do business in Saskatchewan confirming the Proponent's ability to obtain bonding in amounts appropriate for the anticipated project scale, subject to final RFP and contract requirements. The SOQ should also include evidence of the ability to obtain required insurance, including commercial general liability, professional liability, automobile liability, builder's risk, wrap-up liability, contractor's pollution liability, and any other insurance required by the City.

The City may require additional financial information at the RFP stage, including audited financial statements, banking references, surety confirmations, parent company guarantees, joint venture agreements, or other information required to assess financial strength.

#### 4.11 Regional, Community, and Indigenous Considerations

The Proponent should describe how it will support the City's regional and community objectives during design and construction. This may include approaches to local subcontractor engagement, Indigenous participation, community communication support, respectful incorporation of cultural considerations, public-facing project communications, construction mitigation, and coordination with user groups.

The City's current ownership direction does not remove the regional purpose of the project. The Proponent should therefore demonstrate sensitivity to the broader service area, the role of the facility in northwest Saskatchewan, the importance of access and affordability, and the project's potential contribution to reconciliation, youth opportunity, cultural programming, tourism, and community gathering.

## 4.12 Compliance and Exceptions

The Proponent must identify any proposed exceptions, assumptions, qualifications, or deviations from this RFQ. Any deviation is subject to acceptance or rejection by the City in its sole discretion. Failure to identify a deviation may result in the Proponent being deemed to accept the RFQ requirements without qualification.

## SECTION 5 — EVALUATION PROCESS

### 5.1 Evaluation Overview

The City will use a two-stage RFQ evaluation process to identify and shortlist the most qualified Design-Build teams. Stage 1 will consist of a mandatory Pass/Fail review. Only Proponents that achieve a PASS on all mandatory requirements will proceed to Stage 2. Stage 2 will consist of a rated evaluation of the written Statement of Qualifications only. No presentation or interview will be conducted as part of the RFQ evaluation process.

The intent of the RFQ is to identify and shortlist a maximum of four Design-Build teams to participate in the subsequent Design-Build Request for Proposals process. The RFQ evaluation is intended to assess qualifications, capacity, experience, project understanding, team capability, demonstrated Design-Build integration, schedule and mobilization capacity, and fit for a complex Design-Build arena and community recreation project with an estimated construction value exceeding \$75 million.

The City may establish an evaluation committee consisting of City representatives, the Design-Build Facilitator, technical advisors, procurement advisors, and other persons the City considers appropriate. The City may use individual scoring, consensus scoring, reference checks, clarification requests, and any other method it considers appropriate to support a fair and defensible evaluation. Interviews may be used during the subsequent RFP stage, but they will not form part of the RFQ scoring.

### 5.2 Stage 1 — Mandatory Requirements (Pass/Fail)

The following requirements shall be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis. Failure to satisfy any mandatory requirement will result in disqualification from further consideration. The City reserves the right to evaluate the significance of disclosed matters and to determine whether a Proponent has satisfied each mandatory requirement.

#### 5.2.1 Submission Compliance

The submission must be received before the closing deadline, include all required forms and declarations, include all required signatures, acknowledge all addenda, and meet the submission requirements identified within this RFQ.

## 5.2.2 Design-Build Team Structure

The Proponent must identify the proposed Design-Build team, including the lead Design-Builder, prime architectural consultant, structural engineer, mechanical engineer, electrical engineer, civil engineer, project executive, project manager, design manager, and construction manager. The City may consider a submission non-compliant if these core roles are not clearly identified.

## 5.2.3 Financial Capacity, Bonding, and Insurance Requirements

The Proponent must demonstrate sufficient financial capacity to undertake a Design-Build project with an estimated construction value exceeding \$75 million. The lead Design-Builder shall provide audited financial statements for the previous three fiscal years, confirmation of financial capacity to undertake a project of this magnitude, and disclosure of any insolvency proceedings, creditor protection proceedings, or material financial issues during the previous five years.

The Proponent shall provide a letter from a recognized surety licensed to operate in Saskatchewan confirming the Proponent's ability to provide the following minimum bonding requirements:

Bond Type	Minimum Requirement
Bid Bond	10% of Proposal Value
Performance Bond	50% of Contract Value
Labour and Material Payment Bond	50% of Contract Value

The surety letter shall also confirm single project bonding capacity of not less than \$75 million, aggregate bonding capacity of not less than \$150 million, and the current bonding relationship and standing of the Proponent.

The Proponent shall provide confirmation from its insurance broker that it can obtain the following minimum insurance coverage:

Coverage Type	Minimum Coverage
Commercial General Liability	\$25 Million
Professional Liability	\$10 Million
Builder's Risk	Full Replacement Value
Automobile Liability	\$5 Million
Wrap-Up Liability	\$25 Million

## 5.2.4 Construction Experience

The lead constructor shall demonstrate a minimum of two completed projects exceeding \$50 million in construction value within the last ten years, at least one completed public-sector, institutional, recreation, sport, community, or similar facility, and experience as the lead constructor on comparable projects.

## 5.2.5 Design Experience

The lead design consultant shall demonstrate a minimum of two completed facilities exceeding \$50 million in construction value within the last ten years and experience involving recreation, arena, community, sport, institutional, or public facilities.

### 5.2.6 Comparable Project Experience

The Proponent shall demonstrate the successful completion of one Design-Build project with a construction value exceeding \$50 million, one recreation, arena, community recreation centre, fieldhouse, aquatic facility, or similar public-use facility, and one project completed within the previous seven years. Comparable projects may be submitted by the lead Design-Builder, lead constructor, or prime consultant.

### 5.2.7 Safety Requirements

The Proponent shall provide current COR Certification or equivalent, a Saskatchewan WCB Clearance Letter, three-year safety statistics, and confirmation of an active safety management program.

### 5.2.8 Litigation and Claims Disclosure

The Proponent shall disclose material litigation currently in progress, contract disputes, defaults or terminations, and claims exceeding \$1 million within the previous five years. The Owner reserves the right to evaluate the significance of any disclosed matters.

### 5.2.9 Conflict of Interest Declaration

The Proponent shall disclose any actual, perceived, or potential conflicts of interest associated with the project. The City may determine whether any disclosed conflict can be managed, requires mitigation, or results in disqualification.

### 5.2.10 Schedule and Mobilization Capacity

The Proponent shall confirm that it has the capacity, resources, and availability to proceed through the subsequent RFP process, contract negotiation period, pre-construction planning, and construction mobilization in a manner that supports a tentative construction start date of April 1, 2027. Failure to provide this confirmation will result in disqualification.

### 5.2.11 Climate Resilience Experience

The Proponent shall demonstrate that its Design-Build team includes qualified professionals with experience preparing Climate Risk Assessments (CRA) for major public infrastructure projects using recognized methodologies such as ISO 14091, PIEVC Protocol, CSA standards, or equivalent industry-recognized approaches.

The Proponent shall demonstrate successful completion of a minimum of two (2) comparable projects within the previous ten (10) years involving:

- Climate risk assessments;
- Climate adaptation planning;
- Natural hazard risk evaluation;
- Climate resilience measures for public facilities;
- Integration of climate adaptation measures into facility and site design;
- Preparation of climate resilience documentation required for federal, provincial, or municipal infrastructure funding programs.

The Proponent shall identify the qualified professional(s) responsible for preparing the Climate Risk Assessment and supporting climate resilience reporting requirements.

### 5.2.12 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment and Energy Performance Experience

The Proponent shall demonstrate that its Design-Build team includes qualified professionals with experience in greenhouse gas emissions assessment, operational carbon reduction planning, building energy modelling, and low-carbon infrastructure design.

The Proponent shall demonstrate successful completion of a minimum of two (2) comparable projects within the previous ten (10) years involving:

- GHG Assessment Reports;
- Energy and Emissions Modelling Reports;
- Building energy modelling using RETScreen, ENERGY STAR Portfolio Manager, EnergyPlus, IESVE, eQUEST, HAP, or equivalent;
- Building electrification strategies;
- Renewable energy systems;
- Refrigeration heat recovery systems;
- Operational greenhouse gas reduction measures;
- Funding-compliant sustainability reporting.

The Proponent shall identify the qualified professional(s) responsible for preparation of GHG Assessment Reports and Energy and Emissions Modelling Reports.

### 5.3 Stage 2 — Rated Written Submission Evaluation

Only Proponents successfully achieving a PASS on all mandatory requirements will advance to the rated evaluation stage. The rated evaluation will be scored out of 100 points and will be based on the written Statement of Qualifications only. No presentation or interview points will be awarded at the RFQ stage.

Stage 2 Evaluation Component	Maximum Points
Written Statement of Qualifications Evaluation	100
Presentation and Interview Evaluation	Not applicable at RFQ stage
Total Available Points	100

### 5.4 Written Submission Evaluation Criteria (100 Points)

The written Statement of Qualifications will be evaluated using the criteria below. The City may consider the relevance, scale, complexity, delivery model, recency, demonstrated performance, and documented history of the proposed Design-Build team working together when assigning scores. Prior successful experience working together as an integrated Design-Build team will increase potential scores where that experience is directly relevant to this project.

<b>Evaluation Category</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Evaluation Considerations</b>
A. Relevant Project Experience	25	Comparable arena, recreation, community, public-sector, Design-Build, Design-Build, and \$50M+ projects. Higher scores may be awarded where comparable projects were delivered by the same or substantially similar Design-Build team proposed for this RFQ.
B. Design Team Experience and Capability	15	Recreation, arena, public-sector, sustainability, accessibility, and operations-focused design experience. Higher scores may be awarded where the prime architect, engineers, and specialty consultants have previously worked together on comparable Design-Build or recreation projects.
C. Construction Team Experience and Capability	20	Design-Build construction, recreation facility construction, schedule performance, cost management, quality management, safety performance, subcontractor management, and procurement strategy. Higher scores may be awarded where the lead constructor has previously worked with the proposed design partners in a Design-Build environment.
D. Key Personnel	20	Project executive, project manager, design manager, construction manager, lead architect, lead engineers, and arena or refrigeration specialists. Higher scores may be awarded where the same key personnel have previously worked together in similar roles on completed Design-Build or Design-Build projects.
E. Project Delivery Approach	10	Team integration, design management, risk management, quality assurance, schedule control, cost confirmation, Class C Estimate review, Design-Build methodology, and communication. Higher scores may be awarded where the approach clearly explains how previous team collaboration will reduce delivery risk.
F. Climate Resilience, Sustainability, and Low Carbon Infrastructure Experience	10	The City recognizes that climate resilience, greenhouse gas mitigation, energy performance, and sustainability reporting are critical project success factors and are mandatory requirements under the Build Communities Strong Fund (BCSF) and other infrastructure funding programs.
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	

## 5.5 Design-Build Team Continuity and Prior Collaboration Scoring Guidance

The City recognizes that successful Design-Build delivery depends not only on the qualifications of individual firms, but also on how effectively the proposed firms and individuals have worked together as an integrated team. Proponents are encouraged to identify completed projects where

the same or substantially similar Design-Build team members worked together, including the lead Design-Builder, lead constructor, prime architect, design manager, construction manager, lead engineers, arena/refrigeration specialists, cost consultant, scheduler, and other major team members.

Evidence of prior collaboration may increase scores in Relevant Project Experience, Design Team Experience and Capability, Construction Team Experience and Capability, Key Personnel, and Project Delivery Approach. The City will place greater weight on prior collaboration that is recent, directly relevant, completed successfully, supported by owner references, and involves the same firms and key individuals proposed for this project.

**Example — higher potential score:** The lead Design-Builder, constructor, prime architect, design manager, construction manager, mechanical/electrical engineers, and arena/refrigeration specialist previously delivered a \$50 million public recreation centre together, with several of the same key personnel proposed for this RFQ and an owner reference confirming strong collaboration, budget discipline, and schedule performance.

**Example — strong potential score:** The lead constructor and prime architect have delivered two public-sector Design-Build projects together, including one recreation facility. The proposed engineers did not work on those projects but have comparable arena or recreation experience and the submission provides a clear integration plan.

**Example — moderate potential score:** The architect has designed arenas and the contractor has built major public facilities, but they have not previously worked together. The submission explains how the team will integrate, but past performance as a combined Design-Build team is not demonstrated.

**Example — lower potential score:** The Proponent lists highly qualified firms but provides no completed projects involving the same firms or key personnel working together, no description of prior Design-Build collaboration, and no owner references able to speak to team integration.

For clarity, prior Design-Build team collaboration is not a separate mandatory requirement. A Proponent may still pass the mandatory requirements and be evaluated if the firms have not previously worked together. However, because this project requires an integrated Design-Build approach, Proponents that can demonstrate a proven working relationship among the same proposed firms and key personnel may receive higher scores than teams whose experience is only demonstrated at the individual firm level.

## 5.6 Scoring Scale

The City may use the following qualitative scoring guidance when evaluating the written submission. The evaluation committee may adapt this guidance to the point value of each category.

Rating	Score Guidance	General Description
Exceptional	90% to 100% of available points	Submission significantly exceeds requirements, demonstrates highly relevant comparable experience, provides strong evidence of prior Design-Build team collaboration, and presents very low delivery risk.
Very Good	75% to 89% of available points	Submission exceeds requirements in most areas, demonstrates strong relevant experience and capacity, provides credible evidence of team integration and some prior collaboration among proposed team members, and presents manageable delivery risk.
Acceptable	60% to 74% of available points	Submission meets the basic requirements and demonstrates relevant experience, but may include limited prior collaboration among proposed Design-Build team members, limited comparable project examples, or some areas requiring clarification.
Marginal	30% to 59% of available points	Submission partially meets the requirements but contains gaps, limited comparable experience, weak evidence of team integration, little demonstrated history of the proposed team working together, or elevated delivery risk.
Unsatisfactory	0% to 29% of available points	Submission does not adequately address the criterion, contains significant gaps, provides little or no relevant experience, or does not demonstrate capacity to deliver the project.

### 5.7 Minimum Technical Requirements

To be eligible for shortlisting, Proponents must pass all mandatory requirements and achieve the minimum scoring thresholds below. Failure to achieve any minimum threshold may result in the Proponent not being shortlisted, even if the Proponent is otherwise one of the highest-ranked submissions.

Minimum Requirement	Threshold
Written Submission Score	Minimum 75 out of 100
Design Team Experience and Capability	Minimum 10 out of 15
Construction Team Experience and Capability	Minimum 15 out of 25
Key Personnel	Minimum 13 out of 20

### 5.8 Final Scoring Summary

Evaluation Category	Points
Relevant Project Experience	25
Design Team Experience and Capability	15
Construction Team Experience and Capability	20
Key Personnel	20
Project Delivery Approach	10
Climate Resilience, Sustainability, and Low Carbon Infrastructure Experience	10
Total Available	100

## 5.9 Shortlisting

Following completion of the written submission evaluation, Proponents will be ranked according to their total score. Subject to the City's reserved rights, funding approvals, Council direction, and decision to proceed with the subsequent RFP, the four highest-ranked Proponents satisfying all mandatory requirements and minimum scoring thresholds may be invited to participate in the subsequent Design-Build Request for Proposals process. The City may maintain the shortlist for a reasonable period of time if the RFP release is delayed due to funding approvals, Council direction, project readiness, or other City considerations.

If fewer than two Proponents satisfy the mandatory requirements and minimum scoring thresholds, the City reserves the right to cancel the current RFQ process and reissue the procurement in whole or in part. The City also reserves the right to shortlist fewer than four Proponents if, in the opinion of the City, an insufficient number of Proponents demonstrate the qualifications necessary to successfully deliver the project. The City may also choose not to shortlist a Proponent where the City determines that the Proponent presents unacceptable risk, has an unmanaged conflict of interest, lacks required capacity, or is otherwise not in the City's best interest to shortlist.

Shortlisted Proponents will be notified in writing. Proponents not shortlisted will also be notified. Debriefings, if offered, will be conducted after the RFQ process or after the subsequent RFP process, at the City's discretion.

## SECTION 6 — NEXT STAGE RFP PROCESS

### 6.1 RFP to Shortlisted Proponents

The City expects to issue a detailed RFP only to shortlisted Proponents. Subject to funding approvals, Council direction, project readiness, and the City's decision to proceed, the City expects to issue a detailed RFP only to shortlisted Proponents. The timing of the RFP release may be delayed, modified, or cancelled at the City's sole discretion. The RFP is expected to include the Owner's Statement of Requirements, updated project background, available site information, facility program requirements, performance criteria, sustainability and accessibility expectations, year-round ice operation design requirements, anticipated contract terms, insurance and bonding requirements, submission requirements, evaluation criteria, pricing requirements, interview requirements, and the process for selecting a preferred Proponent.

The RFP is expected to remain open for approximately ten weeks to allow shortlisted teams sufficient time to review the project information, assemble complete technical responses, prepare preliminary concepts, assess site and project risks, and develop commercial submissions. The City may hold an information session, site visit, commercially confidential meetings, technical meetings, or other engagement sessions during the RFP stage.

### 6.2 RFP Evaluation and Preferred Proponent Selection

The RFP evaluation is expected to include technical evaluation, pricing and commercial evaluation, interviews, consensus scoring, and a final recommendation. The City may evaluate Proponents based on team capability, understanding of the project, design approach, budget and schedule

alignment, risk strategy, collaboration, interviews, and commercial terms. The City expects that value, fit, capability, and confidence in delivery will be more important than lowest cost alone.

The preferred Proponent, if selected, may be invited to negotiate a Design-Build agreement. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the City may terminate negotiations and proceed with another Proponent, cancel the process, revise the process, or take any other action available to it.

### 6.3 Contract Negotiation and Pre-Construction Confirmation

During contract negotiation and pre-construction confirmation, the preferred Proponent is expected to work collaboratively with the City to confirm the project scope, budget, schedule, risks, design assumptions, constructability, and delivery plan. Deliverables may include a refined project schedule, design confirmation report, cost plan, procurement strategy, risk register, updated site and servicing assessment, permitting strategy, code and accessibility analysis, sustainability strategy, lifecycle and operating considerations, constructability review, value management options, and proposed commercial framework for design and construction.

The contract negotiation and pre-construction confirmation process must provide the City with sufficient information to decide whether to proceed to full design and construction, adjust the scope, seek additional funding, modify the budget, or terminate the project.

### 6.4 Design-Build Delivery and Construction

Subject to successful negotiation, funding, approvals, and contract finalization, the Design-Build delivery phase may include completion of design, permit applications, construction, commissioning, training, occupancy, handover, warranty, and post-occupancy support. The City reserves the right not to proceed for any reason, including budget, funding, approvals, schedule, risk, or failure to reach acceptable commercial terms.

## APPENDIX A — PRELIMINARY SCOPE OF DESIGN-BUILD SERVICES AND DELIVERABLES

During contract negotiation and pre-construction confirmation, the preferred Proponent is expected to work collaboratively with the City to confirm the project scope, budget, schedule, risks, design assumptions, constructability, and delivery plan. Deliverables may include a refined project schedule, design confirmation report, cost plan, procurement strategy, risk register, updated site and servicing assessment, permitting strategy, code and accessibility analysis, sustainability strategy, lifecycle and operating considerations, constructability review, value management options, and proposed commercial framework for design and construction.

The Design-Builder may be required to develop a cost confirmation or cost reconciliation report identifying areas where the Design-Builder agrees with the estimate, areas requiring adjustment, risks requiring further investigation, exclusions requiring owner decisions, and value management opportunities. The report should include recommendations for managing the difference between direct construction cost and total project cost, including soft costs, permits, taxes, owner costs, equipment, furniture, specialty systems, commissioning, contingencies, escalation, financing, and other project-level costs.

The Design-Builder will be expected to support the City in moving from the Class C Estimate toward a reliable project budget and commercial framework. This may include trade market testing, long-lead equipment review, labour availability review, schedule escalation review, constructability review, scope alignment workshops, lifecycle cost review, and value management exercises. The Design-Builder will be expected to maintain the facility's core objectives while identifying practical options to manage affordability.

The Design-Builder must recognize that the Class C Estimate assumes a standard work schedule appropriate to the project size and scope and that premiums for off-hour work, accelerated schedule, work in an operational facility, or other special schedule requirements are only included if identified separately in the estimate. The Design-Builder must identify any schedule assumptions or premiums that may be required under its proposed delivery plan.

### **Climate Resilience, Sustainability, and Low-Carbon Infrastructure Deliverables**

The Design-Builder shall provide all services required to satisfy applicable federal and provincial infrastructure funding requirements, including the Build Communities Strong Fund (BCSF).

#### **The Design-Builder shall be responsible for preparation of:**

##### Climate Risk Assessment

- Climate Risk Assessment prepared by qualified professionals;
- Identification of climate hazards and vulnerabilities;
- Climate scenario analysis;
- Recommended adaptation and mitigation measures;
- Documentation of residual risks;
- Identification of applicable standards and guidelines;

- Demonstration that mitigation measures do not transfer risk to adjacent properties or communities.

#### Greenhouse Gas Assessment Report

- Identification of project emissions sources;
- Baseline operational emissions assessment;
- Project emissions assessment;
- Quantification of emissions reductions;
- Documentation of assumptions and methodologies;
- Funding-compliant reporting.

#### Energy and Emissions Modelling Report

- Whole-building energy modelling;
- Baseline and proposed energy performance analysis;
- Annual energy consumption projections;
- Peak demand analysis;
- Greenhouse gas reduction analysis;
- Evaluation of building envelope, HVAC, refrigeration, lighting, controls, domestic hot water, and renewable energy systems;
- Preparation of reports suitable for submission to funding agencies.

#### Sustainability and Low-Carbon Design Strategy

- Building electrification opportunities;
- Renewable energy opportunities;
- Refrigeration heat recovery opportunities;
- Waste heat recovery opportunities;
- Energy efficiency measures;
- Lifecycle cost analysis;
- Operational carbon reduction strategies;
- Long-term sustainability recommendations.

## APPENDIX B — STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS SUBMISSION FORM

**Request for Qualifications No.: CNB-PR-2026-06-17**

**Project: Design-Build Services for the Battlefords Regional Twin Pad Arena & Events Centre**

**Owner: The Corporation of the City of North Battleford**

**Closing Date and Time: July 8, 2026 at 2:00 p.m., Saskatchewan Time**

**Submission Method: City-designated online bid platform**

I/WE hereby submit this Statement of Qualifications for the provision of Design-Build Services for the Battlefords Regional Twin Pad Arena & Events Centre, as described in the Request for Qualifications document, including all appendices, schedules, forms, reference documents, and addenda issued by the City.

I/WE have carefully examined the RFQ documents and all addenda issued by the City. I/WE confirm that we have a clear and comprehensive understanding of the RFQ requirements, the project context, the preliminary Design-Build scope, the current Class C construction cost benchmark, the Design-Build procurement process, and the requirement to participate in a subsequent RFP process if shortlisted.

I/WE agree that, if shortlisted, we will participate in good faith in the subsequent RFP process, subject to the terms of the RFP to be issued by the City. I/WE acknowledge that shortlisting through this RFQ does not create a contract, does not guarantee award of any work, does not entitle the Proponent to compensation, and does not obligate the City to proceed with the RFP, negotiation, award, Design-Build agreement, or construction.

I/WE confirm that the Proponent has reviewed the anticipated procurement schedule and has the capacity, resources, and availability to proceed through the RFP, contract negotiation, pre-construction planning, and construction mobilization in a manner that supports a tentative construction start date of April 1, 2027, subject to City approvals, funding, final contract execution, and authority having jurisdiction requirements.

I/WE agree that the Statement of Qualifications has been prepared without collusion, fraud, prohibited communications, lobbying, or any attempt to obtain an unfair advantage. I/WE further agree that all information contained in this Statement of Qualifications is true, accurate, and complete to the best of our knowledge.

I/WE acknowledge receipt of the following addenda:

Addendum No. \_\_\_\_\_ dated \_\_\_\_\_

Addendum No. \_\_\_\_\_ dated \_\_\_\_\_

Addendum No. \_\_\_\_\_ dated \_\_\_\_\_

Addendum No. \_\_\_\_\_ dated \_\_\_\_\_

I/WE acknowledge that the highest-ranked Proponent, or any Proponent, will not necessarily be shortlisted or selected, and that the City reserves all rights set out in the RFQ, including the right to reject any or all submissions, waive irregularities, seek clarification, amend the process, cancel the process, or proceed in any other manner determined by the City to be in its best interests.

**Proponent's Legal Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Operating Name, if different:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Lead Entity, if consortium or joint venture:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Street Address:** \_\_\_\_\_

**City:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Province:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Postal Code:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Primary Contact Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Title:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Email:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Phone:** \_\_\_\_\_

Signed at \_\_\_\_\_, Saskatchewan, this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2026.

**Authorized Signing Officer Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Authorized Signing Officer Title:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

THIS FORM SHALL BE SIGNED BY AN OFFICER OR REPRESENTATIVE WITH AUTHORITY TO BIND THE PROPONENT. AN ELECTRONIC OR SCANNED SIGNATURE IS ACCEPTABLE WHERE ELECTRONIC SUBMISSIONS ARE PERMITTED BY THE CITY.

## APPENDIX C — DRAFT DECLARATION OF DISCLOSURE

To: The Corporation of the City of North Battleford

RFQ No.: CNB-PR-2026-06-17

Project: Design-Build Services for the Battlefords Regional Twin Pad Arena & Events Centre

**Name of Proponent:** \_\_\_\_\_

I/WE DECLARE that no person, company, corporation, partnership, joint venture, consortium, or other entity, other than those identified in this Statement of Qualifications, has any undisclosed interest in this RFQ submission or in any future contract that may arise from this procurement process.

I/WE FURTHER DECLARE that this Statement of Qualifications has been prepared fairly and without collusion, fraud, bid-rigging, undisclosed compensation, improper communication, or any attempt to influence the outcome of the RFQ process.

I/WE FURTHER DECLARE that no City employee, member of Council, member of a City agency, board or commission, evaluator, advisor, consultant, or representative of the City, or any member of their immediate family, is or will become interested directly or indirectly as a contracting party or otherwise in the performance of any resulting contract, in the supplies, work, or business to which it relates, in any portion of the profits thereof, or in any monies to be derived therefrom, except as fully disclosed in this Statement of Qualifications.

I/WE FURTHER DECLARE that all statements, representations, certifications, schedules, forms, and attachments contained in this Statement of Qualifications are true and accurate to the best of our knowledge.

I/WE AGREE that this Statement of Qualifications shall remain open for consideration by the City for a period of ninety calendar days after the RFQ closing date, unless otherwise stated in the RFQ or extended by agreement.

I/WE ACKNOWLEDGE that this RFQ is a qualifications process only and does not create any right to award, compensation, negotiation, or contract.

**Signature of Authorized Signing Officer:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Print Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Position:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Proponent:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX D — INSURANCE, BONDING, WCB, SAFETY, AND COMPLIANCE

### APPENDIX D-1 — INSURANCE AND BONDING CAPACITY FORM

The Proponent acknowledges that the Battlefords Regional Twin Pad Arena and Events Centre is a major civic Design-Build project. The current Class C Estimate identifies a Total Construction Cost of \$74,506,700 and a Total + Construction Allowance of \$78,232,000. The Proponent acknowledges that these figures are construction cost benchmarks only and do not represent the full total project budget.

The Proponent shall provide evidence of its ability to obtain insurance, bonding, and performance security appropriate for a Design-Build project with an estimated construction value exceeding \$75 million. The final insurance, bonding, and security requirements will be set out in the RFP and contract documents. The minimum requirements below are included for RFQ qualification purposes.

#### 1. Insurance Capacity

The Proponent shall provide confirmation from its insurance broker that it can obtain the following minimum insurance coverage:

<b>Insurance Type</b>	<b>Minimum / Expected Capacity</b>	<b>Confirmed? Yes/No</b>	<b>Insurer / Broker</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Commercial General Liability	\$25 million			
Professional Liability / Errors and Omissions	\$10 million			
Builder's Risk / Course of Construction	Full replacement value			
Automobile Liability	\$5 million			
Wrap-Up Liability	\$25 million			
Contractor's Pollution Liability	To be confirmed in RFP			
Other	To be confirmed in RFP			

Attach broker letter or certificate confirming insurance capacity, where available.

#### 2. Bonding and Surety Capacity

The Proponent shall attach a letter from a recognized surety company licensed to do business in Saskatchewan confirming that the Proponent has sufficient bonding capacity for a project of this scale, subject to review of the final RFP, contract, and financial terms.

<b>Security Type</b>	<b>Minimum Requirement</b>	<b>Confirmed? Yes/No</b>	<b>Surety Name</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Bid Bond	10% of Proposal Value			
Performance Bond	50% of Contract Value			
Labour and Material Payment Bond	50% of Contract Value			
Single Project Bonding Capacity	Not less than \$75 million			
Aggregate Bonding Capacity	Not less than \$150 million			
Current Bonding Relationship and Standing	Surety letter to confirm			

Surety Contact Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Surety Company: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

The Proponent acknowledges that the City may require updated surety, insurance, and financial capacity information at the RFP stage.

Authorized Signing Officer: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX D-2 — WCB AND HEALTH & SAFETY COMPLIANCE FORM

The Proponent shall complete this form for the Design-Build lead / construction lead and any major construction partner.

Proponent / Construction Lead: \_\_\_\_\_

WCB Account Number: \_\_\_\_\_

WCB Status:

- Registered
- In good standing
- Clearance letter attached
- Clearance letter to be provided before contract execution
- Not applicable — explain: \_\_\_\_\_

Safety Certification:

- COR
- SECOR
- ISO 45001
- Internal safety management system
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Certification attached

Safety Program

Required Item	Yes/No	Notes
Corporate Health and Safety Policy		
Safety Manual / Program Summary		
WCB Clearance Letter		
COR / SECOR / Equivalent Certificate		
Sample Hazard Assessment / Job Hazard Analysis		
Sample Site-Specific Safety Plan		
Incident Reporting Procedure		
Emergency Response Procedure		
Subcontractor Safety Management Procedure		
Training Matrix or Competency Program		

The Proponent confirms that it will comply with all applicable occupational health and safety legislation, Saskatchewan WCB requirements, City safety requirements, site-specific safety requirements, and any additional safety requirements set out in the RFP or contract documents. The proponent will supply the above safety program material if requested by the City.

Authorized Signing Officer: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_